

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SCOTT PHILLIP LEWIS,

Plaintiff,

-against-

8:25-CV-18 (LEK/MJK)

MATTHEW MEYER, *et al.*,

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

On January 4, 2025, Plaintiff Scott Phillip Lewis brought this action against Defendants Matthew Meyer, Amy Conway, and Erica Putnam Little. Dkt. No. 1 (“Complaint”). Plaintiff also filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis. Dkt. No. 2 (“IFP Application”). On January 16, 2025, the Honorable Mitchell J. Katz, United States Magistrate Judge, issued an order granting the IFP Application and a report and recommendation, recommending that the Complaint be dismissed. Dkt. No. 6 (“Report and Recommendation”) at 6–7. For the reasons that follow, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

The Court assumes familiarity with the background detailed in the Report and Recommendation. *See generally* R. & R. at 3, 5–6. In the Report and Recommendation, Judge Katz noted that each Defendant worked as an attorney for the New York Appellate Division, Third Judicial Department. *Id.* at 5. He recommended that Plaintiff’s Complaint be dismissed because “Defendants’ interactions with [P]laintiff were in furtherance of their respective job functions, all of which were closely associated with and essential to the judicial process,” and Defendants enjoy judicial immunity from the claims asserted by Plaintiff. *Id.* at 6.

“Within fourteen days after being served with a copy [of the Magistrate Judge’s report and recommendation], any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); *see also* L.R. 72.1. However, if no objections are made, a district court need only review a report and recommendation for clear error. *See DiPilato v. 7-Eleven, Inc.*, 662 F. Supp. 2d 333, 339 (S.D.N.Y. 2009) (“The district court may adopt those portions of a report and recommendation to which no timely objections have been made, provided no clear error is apparent from the face of the record.”).

No party objected to the Report and Recommendation within fourteen days after being served with a copy of it. Accordingly, the Court reviews the Report and Recommendation for clear error. *See DiPilato*, 662 F. Supp. 2d at 339. Having found none, the Court approves and adopts the Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

Accordingly, it is hereby:

ORDERED, that the Report and Recommendation, Dkt. No. 6, is **ADOPTED in its entirety**; and it is further

ORDERED, that Plaintiff’s Complaint, Dkt. No. 1, is **DISMISSED**; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Clerk close this action; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Clerk serve a copy of this Decision and Order on all parties in accordance with the Local Rules.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 25, 2025
Albany, New York


LAWRENCE E. KAHN
United States District Judge